

A REMARK ON FEJÉR AND MITTAG-LEFFLER THEOREMS

BY MAREK JARNICKI AND JÓZEF SICIĄK

Abstract. We discuss some generalizations of the classical Fejér and Mittag-Leffler theorems to the case of several complex variables with applications to the Shilov and Bergman boundaries.

1. Introduction. For a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ let $\mathcal{A}(D)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D})$) denote the space of all continuous functions $f : \overline{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $f|_D$ is holomorphic (resp. f extends holomorphically to a neighborhood of \overline{D}). Let $\partial_S D$ (resp. $\partial_B D$) be the *Shilov* (resp. *Bergman*) *boundary* of D , i.e. the minimal compact set $K \subset \overline{D}$ such that $\max_K |f| = \max_{\overline{D}} |f|$ for every $f \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{D})$). Obviously, $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D}) \subset \mathcal{A}(D)$ and hence $\partial_B D \subset \partial_S D \subset \partial D$. Notice that, in general, $\partial_B D \subsetneq \partial_S D$, e.g. for the domain $D := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : 0 < |z| < 1, |w| < |z|^{-\log |z|}\}$ (cf. [6], § 16).

The algebra $\mathcal{A}(D)$ endowed with the supremum norm is a Banach algebra. Then $\partial_S D$ coincides with the Shilov boundary of $\mathcal{A}(D)$ in the sense of uniform algebras (cf. [7], Chap. I, Sec. H). Moreover, the Bergman boundary $\partial_B D$ coincides with the Shilov boundary of the uniform algebra $\mathcal{B}(D)$ defined as the uniform closure in $\mathcal{A}(D)$ of $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D})|_{\overline{D}}$.

Assume that the envelope of holomorphy \tilde{D} of D is univalent. We are interested in characterizations of those domains D for which $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ (resp. $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$) (cf. [9]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32A07, 32D10, 32D15.

Key words and phrases. Fejér theorem, Mittag-Leffler theorem, balanced domain, star-like domain, Shilov boundary, Bergman boundary.

The first author was partially supported by grant No. UMO-2011/03/B/ST1/04758 of the Polish National Science Center (NCN).

REMARK 1.1. (a) It is well known (cf. [8], Remark 1.4.5(h)) that

$$(*) \quad \sup_{\tilde{D}} |g| = \sup_D |g|, \quad g \in \mathcal{O}(\tilde{D}).$$

In particular, if D is bounded, then so is \tilde{D} .

- (b) It is also well known that if $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is Reinhardt (resp. balanced, resp. starlike) domain, then \tilde{D} is univalent and \tilde{D} is Reinhardt (resp. balanced, resp. starlike) (cf. [8], Remark 1.9.6(c,e,f), Corollary 1.9.18).
- (c) Let $D \subset G \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be domains such that G is a domain of holomorphy and (D, G) is a *Runge pair*, i.e. the space $\mathcal{O}(G)|_D$ is dense in $\mathcal{O}(D)$. Then the envelope of holomorphy of D is univalent and (\tilde{D}, G) is a Runge pair (cf. [3], see also [8], Proposition 3.1.22). In particular, the result applies if $G = \mathbb{C}^N$ and polynomials are dense in $\mathcal{O}(D)$.

First, let us recall some known results.

REMARK 1.2. (a) Since $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}} \subset \mathcal{A}(D)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{D})$), we get $\partial_S \tilde{D} \subset \partial_S D$ (resp. $\partial_B \tilde{D} \subset \partial_B D$).

- (b) If $\mathcal{A}(D) \subset \mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D}) \subset \mathcal{O}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$), then $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ (resp. $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$).
- (c) There exists a bounded Reinhardt domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}_* \times \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathcal{A}(D) \not\subset \mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$ (cf. [11], Example 6.1). On the other hand, if $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is a bounded Reinhardt domain, then $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ (cf. [11], Corollary 6.2).
- (d) If \overline{D} has a neighborhood basis consisting of domains with univalent envelopes of holomorphy, then $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D}) \subset \mathcal{O}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$ and hence $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$.

In fact, by (b), we only need to prove that if $\overline{D} \subset G \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, where G is a bounded domain with a univalent envelope of holomorphy \tilde{G} , then $\overline{\tilde{D}} \subset \tilde{G}$. For every $g \in \mathcal{O}(\tilde{G})$, using (*), we get $\sup_{\tilde{D}} |g| = \sup_D |g| = \max_{\overline{D}} |g|$. Thus $\tilde{D} \subset \widehat{\overline{D}}_{\mathcal{O}(\tilde{G})} \subset \tilde{G}$, where $\widehat{K}_{\mathcal{O}(\Omega)} := \{z \in \Omega : \forall_{g \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)} : |g(z)| \leq \max_K |g|\}$ (cf. [8], Theorem 1.10.4).

- (e) Let $\mathbb{B}(a, r)$ denote the Euclidean ball centered at $a \in \mathbb{C}^N$ with radius $r > 0$; $\mathbb{B}(r) := \mathbb{B}(0, r)$. If $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is a bounded balanced (resp. starlike) domain, then $\{\overline{D} + \mathbb{B}(\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ gives a neighborhood basis of \overline{D} consisting of bounded balanced (resp. starlike) domains. Hence $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$.
- (f) If $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$ and $\mathcal{A}(D) = \mathcal{B}(D)$, then $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$.

Indeed, $\partial_S D = \partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D} \subset \partial_S \tilde{D} \subset \partial_S D$.

- (g) There exists a bounded Hartogs domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with a univalent envelope of holomorphy \tilde{D} such that $\partial_S D \neq \partial_S \tilde{D}$, $\partial_B D \neq \partial_B \tilde{D}$, and $\mathcal{O}(\overline{D}) \not\subset \mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$ (cf. [9]).

The paper is organized as follows:

— first, we prove two general theorems on polynomial approximation in balanced and starlike domains (Theorems 2.1, 3.1); these results are of independent interest;

— next, we prove the following result.

- THEOREM 1.3. (a) *If D is a bounded balanced domain, then $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ and $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$.*
 (b) *If D is a bounded strictly starlike domain, then $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ and $\partial_B D = \partial_B \tilde{D}$.*

Notice that (a) answers an open problem formulated in [9].

Recall that a bounded starlike domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is said to be *strictly starlike with respect to the origin* if $\overline{D} \subset (1 + \varepsilon)D$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$. The equality $\partial_S D = \partial_S \tilde{D}$ for an arbitrary bounded starlike domain D seems to be an open problem.

2. Fejér theorem for holomorphic functions.

THEOREM 2.1 (Fejér theorem). *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a bounded balanced domain, let $f \in \mathcal{A}(D)$, and let*

$$f(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q_j(z), \quad z \in D,$$

be the Taylor series development of f in D (Q_j is a homogeneous polynomial of degree j). Put

$$s_n := \sum_{j=0}^n Q_j, \quad \sigma_n := \frac{s_0 + \cdots + s_{n-1}}{n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $\sigma_n \longrightarrow f$ uniformly on \overline{D} .

PROOF. It is known that for arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in D$ we have

$$\sigma_n(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(e^{it}z) F_n(t) dt,$$

where

$$F_n(t) := \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\sin \frac{1}{2}nt}{\sin \frac{1}{2}t} \right)^2$$

is the n -th Fejér kernel. In particular,

$$1 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} F_n(t) dt, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $M := \max_{\overline{D}} |f|$, $\omega(\delta) := \max\{|f(e^{it}z) - f(z)| : z \in \overline{D}, |t| \leq \delta\}$, $\delta > 0$. Since the function $\overline{D} \times [-\pi, \pi] \ni (z, t) \mapsto f(e^{it}z)$ is uniformly continuous, we have $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0+} \omega(\delta) = 0$. The standard reasoning gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_n(z) - f(z)| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|t| \leq \delta} |f(e^{it}z) - f(z)| F_n(t) dt \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\delta < |t| \leq \pi} |f(e^{it}z) - f(z)| F_n(t) dt \leq \omega(\delta) + \frac{2M}{n \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}\delta}, \quad z \in D, \quad 0 < \delta < \pi. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we first find a $\delta \in (0, \pi)$ such that $\omega(\delta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and next we choose an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\frac{2M}{n \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}\delta} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for $n \geq n_0$. Finally, $|\sigma_n(z) - f(z)| \leq \varepsilon$ for $n \geq n_0$ and $z \in D$, and therefore for $z \in \overline{D}$. \square

3. Mittag-Leffler theorem.

THEOREM 3.1 (Mittag-Leffler theorem, cf. [5]). *There exist numbers $c_{n,j} \in \mathbb{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, k_n\}$, such that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, for every starlike domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, and for every $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ with the Taylor development*

$$f(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q_j(z)$$

in a neighborhood of 0, the sequence of polynomials

$$\sigma_n := \sum_{j=0}^{k_n} c_{n,j} Q_j, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

converges to f locally uniformly in D . In particular, the sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is locally uniformly convergent in the maximal starlike domain G_f to which f is analytically continuable (G_f is called the Mittag-Leffler star).

- REMARK 3.2.** (a) The case $N = 1$ is due to Mittag-Leffler (cf. [12]).
 (b) Our proof of Theorem 3.1 will be based on a method proposed (for $N = 1$) by E. Borel (cf. [2]).
 (c) Generalizations of the Mittag-Leffler theorem to the case $N \geq 2$ were studied (using various methods) by several authors (cf. e.g. [1], [10], [5]).
 (d) Theorem 3.1 implies that polynomials are dense in $\mathcal{O}(D)$ (see also [4]). In particular, the envelope of holomorphy \tilde{D} of D is a starlike Runge domain (cf. Remark 1.1(c)).

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Runge's theorem there exists a sequence $\{W_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of polynomials that converges locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ to

the function $W(\lambda) := \frac{1}{1-\lambda}$. Let

$$W_n(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{k_n} c_{n,j} \lambda^j, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Fix $f \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ and $a \in D$. Since $[0, 1] \cdot a$ is a compact subset of D there exists an $r > 0$ such that $\Delta \cdot \overline{\mathbb{B}}(a, r) \subset D$, where

$$\Delta := \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : -r \leq x \leq 1 + r, |y| \leq r\}.$$

For every $z \in \mathbb{B}(a, r)$, the function $\lambda \mapsto f(\lambda z)$ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of Δ . In particular,

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f(\lambda z) d\lambda}{\lambda - 1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{B}(a, r),$$

where Γ is the positively oriented boundary of Δ . On the other hand, for $z \in \mathbb{B}(a, r)$ we get

$$\sigma_n(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{k_n} c_{n,j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f(\lambda z) d\lambda}{\lambda^{j+1}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} f(\lambda z) W_n\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}.$$

Consequently,

$$f(z) - \sigma_n(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f(\lambda z)}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\lambda}} - W_n\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \right) d\lambda, \quad z \in \mathbb{B}(a, r).$$

Since $W_n(\frac{1}{\lambda}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\lambda}}$ uniformly for $\lambda \in \partial\Delta$, we conclude that $\sigma_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly on $\mathbb{B}(a, r)$. \square

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3. The case of the Bergman boundary follows from Remark 1.2(e).

(a) It suffices to show that $\mathcal{A}(D) \subset \mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})|_{\overline{D}}$ (cf. Remark 1.2(b)). Fix an $f \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ and let $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be as in § 2. Using Theorem 2.1 and the equation (*) of Remark 1.1 we conclude that the sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly convergent on \tilde{G} to a function $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{D})$, which completes the proof of (a).

(b) Fix a sequence $\varepsilon_n \searrow 0$ and let $D_n := (1 + \varepsilon_n)D \supset \overline{D}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Take an $f \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ and let $f_n(z) := f(\frac{z}{1+\varepsilon_n})$, $z \in D_n$. Then $f_n|_{\overline{D}} \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{D})$ and $f_n|_{\overline{D}} \rightarrow f$ uniformly on \overline{D} . Thus $f \in \mathcal{B}(D)$. Now, the result follows from Remark 1.2(e)(f). \square

REMARK 4.1. Observe that Theorem 1.3(b) may be also proved via Theorem 3.1. In fact, applying Theorem 3.1 to (D_n, f_n) , we conclude that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a polynomial P_n such that $|f_n(z) - P_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{n}$, $z \in \overline{D}$. Thus the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to f uniformly on \overline{D} . Now, we can finish the proof as in (a).

References

1. Almer B., *Sur quelques problèmes de la théorie des fonctions analytiques de deux variables complexes*, Ark. Math., **17** (1922), 1–70.
2. Borel E., *Addition au mémoire sur les séries divergentes*, Ann. sci. de l'É.N.S., **16** (1899), 132–136.
3. Casadio-Tarabusi E., Trapani S., *Envelopes of holomorphy of Hartogs and circular domains*, Pacific J. Math., **149** (1991), 231–249.
4. Chirka G. M., *Approximation by polynomials on star-like subsets of \mathbb{C}^n* (Russian), Mat. Zametki, **14** (1973), 55–60.
5. Downarowicz M., *Analytic continuation of series of homogeneous polynomials of n complex variables*, Univ. Jag. Acta Math., **17** (1975), 105–114.
6. Fuks B. A., *Special chapters in the theory of analytic functions of several complex variables*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 14, AMS, Providence, R. I., 1965.
7. Gunning R., Rossi H., *Analytic Functions of Several Complex Variables*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.
8. Jarnicki M., Pflug P., *Extension of Holomorphic Functions*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 34, Walter de Gruyter, 2000.
9. Jarnicki M., Pflug P., *A counterexample to a theorem of Bremermann on Shilov boundaries*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **143** (2015), 1675–1677.
10. Knopp K., *Über Polynomentwicklungen im Mittag-Lefflerschen Stern Durch Anwendung der Eulerschen Reihentransformation*, Acta Math., **47** (1926), 313–335.
11. Kosiński L., Zwonek W., *Proper holomorphic mappings vs. peak points and Shilov boundary*, Ann. Polon. Math., **107** (2013), 97–108.
12. Mittag-Leffler G., *Sur la représentation analytique d'une branche uniforme d'une fonction monogène*, Note 1–5, Acta Math., **23** (1900), 43–62; **24** (1901), 183–204; **24** (1901), 205–244; **26** (1902), 353–391; **29** (1905), 101–181.

Received May 12, 2015

Institute of Mathematics
 Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
 Jagiellonian University
 Łojasiewicza 6, 30-348 Kraków
 Poland
e-mail: Marek.Jarnicki@im.uj.edu.pl
e-mail: Jozef.Siciak@im.uj.edu.pl